THE NAUTILUS.

VOL. III. AUGUST, 1889. No. 4.

PUPA HOLZINGERI, n. sp.

BY DR. V. STERKI.

IN the spring of 1887, Mr. John A. Holzinger, of Winona, Minn., sent me a lot of small Pupa, among which there was one specimen of a new species. It was dead, weather-beaten, poor shell, but evidently adult. By repeated, ever so careful examinations it broke to pieces, but not before I had made a drawing and description of it. Mr. Holzinger as well as a few of his students then endeavored to secure more specimens, but all their efforts have been in vain, so far. In 1888, in a vial with Pupa from northern Illinois sent by Mr. Wm. A. Marsh, I found a few more specimens of evidently the same species, the shells fresh and good. This year, at last, among a number of small Pupa collected at Davenport, Ia., I was lucky in detecting three more examples. The validity of the species was, consequently, established; and on the other hand it proved to be a form quite distinct, not doubtfully separable from any other species.

It is a more interesting and valuable addition to our malacological fauna as it belongs to a specifically American group,* viz.: that of *P. armifera* and *P. contracta* Say; but it is as much smaller than the latter of the two named as this is than the former. Yet the three together form a well characterized and well defined group of evidently common origin, and it may be possible sometime, and

* It is possible, and even probable, however, that certain species of Pupa described from eastern Asia range among the same group; yet as I have seen no specimens and know them only from the descriptions, I am unable to judge about them.

would be an interesting task of Paleontology, to detect a fossil form, or forms, from which the recent ones are derived.

So far, it has not been possible to examine the soft parts and thus complete our knowledge and description of the species; but it is to be expected that the necessary fresh, if possible living specimens will be found, and I hereby would invite the active collectors of the north-western States to look specially for this Pupa, in order not only to make a complete examination, but also to know more about its geographical distribution, and possible variations.

Description.

Shell narrowly perforated, turrited-cylindrical, vitreous (or whitish), very minutely striate, shining; apex rather pointed; whorls 5, regularly increasing, well rounded, especially the upper ones, the last somewhat narrowed and a little ascending towards the aperture, compressed at the base but not carinated, at some distance from the outer margin provided with an oblique, rather prominent, acute crest corresponding in direction to the lines of growth, extending from the base to the suture, formed by a whitish callosity; behind the crest the whorl is flattened, and corresponding to the lower palatal lamella, impressed; aperture lateral, scarcely oblique, relatively small, inverted subovate, with a slight sinus at the upper part of the outer wall, margins approximated; peristome moderately reflected; lamellæ 6; one parietal, rather long, very high, in its middle part curved outward, towards the aperture bifurcated, the outer branch reaching the parietal wall; one columellar, longitudinal, rather high, its upper end turning in nearly a right angle towards the aperture, but not reaching the margin; basal exactly at the base, short, high, dentiform; 3 in the outer wall, viz.: the lower palatal long ending in the callus, highest at about its middle; the upper short, rather high on the callous; above the upper one suprapalatal, quite small, dentiform, nearer the margin.

Length 1·7 mill., diam. 0·8 mill. (·068 x ·032 inches).

As already stated, our species ranges beside *P. armifera* and *P. contracta* Say, standing nearer the latter. Yet it is different from this species by the shape of the aperture, the wanting callous* connecting the margins on the body whorl, by the longer crest behind the aperture, which in contracta disappears in about the middle of

* In many specimens of *P. contracta* so strongly developed, that the peristome is rendered continuous.

the (height of the) whorl, and by the wanting constriction, especially in the columellar wall, not to speak of the size and shape of the whole shell. The lamellæ also show some marked differences, such as the presence of a high basal, the shorter columellar not reaching the base, but with relatively larger horizontal part, the bifurcation of the parietal and the presence of a supra-palatal, the last just as it is in P. armifera.

It must be added here that the specimen first obtained from Minnesota in several respects differs from those found in Illinois and Iowa, which I consider as typical; by its size which is ⅓ smaller, by the basal lamella developed in a peculiar way, being rather longer at the truncated top than at its foot, and by the stronger, thicker palatal lamellæ. Yet, as there was only one specimen, it was liable to be an individual peculiarity—even then of interest. Should, however, more specimens be found with the same configuration, they would represent a distinct and well characterized variety; possibly it is a peculiar northern form.

New Philadelphia, Ohio, June, 1889.

ON MR. PILSBRY'S CRITICS UPON SOME AMERICAN SHELLS.

BY C. F. ANCEY.

In the 9th No. of the *Conchologists' Exchange*, Vol. II, 1888, p. 113, Mr. H. A. Pilsbry wrote: "On *Lyogyrus*, Gill, and other American shells," in which several subgeneric and specific names proposed by European scientists for N. American shells, particularly by Dr. Westerlund and myself are sharply criticised. Of course criticism is good whenever errors generally diffused are to be destroyed, and when not inconsiderate. I intended, at first, to write about this subject in "*Le Naturaliste*," where "some of Mr. Crosse's genera are so rudely handled," but I at length determined to insert my article in the same paper as that in which Mr. Pilsbry published his own note, in order to be read by the same naturalists.

It will be remarked at first, that before speaking about the new species proposed by such a man as Dr. Westerlund, an eminent conchologist, and certainly, together with Dr. W. H. Dall, the one who is the best acquainted with the conchological fauna of the Arctic countries, it would be well to compare either his shells with authentic specimens of those formerly described, or his *very accurate*